DESY 02–193
November 2002

hep-ph/0211191

arXiv:hep-ph/0211191v1 13 Nov 2002

$O(\alpha^2 L)$ Radiative Corrections to Deep Inelastic ep Scattering

Johannes Blümlein and Hiroyuki Kawamura

Deutsches Elektronen–Synchrotron, DESY,
Platanenallee 6, D–15735 Zeuthen, Germany

Abstract

The leptonic QED radiative corrections are calculated in the next-to-leading log approximation $\mathcal{O}\left[\alpha^2 \ln(Q^2/m_e^2)\right]$ for unpolarized deeply inelastic ep–scattering in the case of mixed variables. The corrections are determined using mass factorization in the OMS–scheme for the double–differential scattering cross sections.

1 Introduction

Deeply inelastic electron–nucleon scattering provides one of the cleanest methods to test QCD by measuring the scaling violations of structure functions from which the QCD–scale $\Lambda_{\rm QCD}$, one of the fundamental parameters of the Standard Model, is derived with high precision. The QCD–analysis also delivers the various twist–2 parton distributions as functions of x and Q^2, the detailed knowledge of which is necessary for the forthcoming experimental search for the Higgs–boson and new, yet undiscovered states beyond the Standard Model, at TEVATRON and LHC. One of the major goals of the experiments H1 and ZEUS at the ep–collider HERA at DESY is to perform a QCD test at large space–like virtualities Q^2 at high precision. This presumes to know the QED radiative corrections to the double–differential scattering cross sections of deeply inelastic ep corrections as precisely as possible. Previous calculations of the radiative corrections for the unpolarized cross sections at leading order [1–5][1], the leading–log level [7–12] to leading and higher orders, and QED–resummations of small–x terms [11,13][2] orders revealed that these corrections are very large, particularly in the interesting regions of small x and for almost all x at large inelasticities $y = Q^2/(Sx)$. The corrections are, moreover, complicated by a new type of sizeable contributions as the Compton–peak [15]. This makes it necessary to extend the calculations to higher orders.

The higher order leading–logarithmic contributions $O\left[(\alpha L)^k\right]$ to QED corrections are obtained as the leading order solution of the associated renormalization group equations [16] for mass factorization. These corrections are universal, process–independent w.r.t. their structure, and are given in terms of Mellin–convolutions of leading order QED splitting functions. The next–to–leading order (NLO) corrections can be obtained along the same line. However, besides the splitting functions to NLO also the respective process–dependent Wilson coefficients and operator matrix elements in the on-mass-shell (OMS) scheme contribute. In the past this method was applied to a single differential distribution for the $O(\alpha^2)$ initial–state QED radiative corrections to $e^+e^- \to \mu^+\mu^-$ in Ref. [17].

In this letter we calculate the leptonic QED corrections to deeply inelastic ep scattering, where we define the double–differential scattering cross section choosing mixed variables [8,2,5], in $O(\alpha^2 L)$. If compared to the case dealt with in [17] to $O(\alpha^2 L)$ the present calculation is more complicated due to the emergence of final state radiation, the double–differential cross section and the relevant rescaling, which implies non–Mellin type convolutions in general. After summarizing main kinematic aspects we present the different contributions to the leptonic NLO QED corrections. Further details of the calculation and numerical results will be given elsewhere [18].

2 Mixed variables

ep collider experiments allow to measure the kinematic variables defining the inclusive deep–inelastic scattering cross sections in various ways since four kinematic variables are available in principle with the energies and angles of both the outgoing lepton and the struck–quark, see

[1] For QED corrections to polarized lepton scattering off polarized nucleons see [6].
[2] For related numerical results for QCD singlet evolution see [14].

e.g. [19]. At the Born level all methods are equivalent, however, resolution effects as a consequence of the detector's structure, differ in certain kinematic regions. The Bremsstrahlung–effects of QED radiative corrections change this picture drastically and the QED correction factors depend on the way the kinematic variables, as e.g. Bjorken–y and the virtuality Q^2 are measured.[3] In the present paper we calculate the NLO radiative corrections in the case of neutral current deep–inelastic scattering for mixed variables, i.e. that $Q^2 = Q_l^2$ is measured at the leptonic and $y = y_h$ is measured at the hadronic vertex, and $x_m = Q_l^2/(Sy_h)$. The Born cross section for γ–exchange is given by[4] :

$$\frac{d^2\sigma^{(0)}}{dydQ^2} \equiv C^{(0,0)}(y,Q^2) = \frac{2\pi\alpha^2}{yQ^4}\left[y^2\ 2xF_1(x,Q^2) + 2(1-y)\ F_2(x,Q^2)\right], \tag{1}$$

with

$$F_1(x,Q^2) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{N_f}\left[q_k(x,Q^2) + \overline{q}_k(x,Q^2)\right], \tag{2}$$

$$F_2(x,Q^2) = 2xF_1(x,Q^2) + F_L(x,Q^2)\ . \tag{3}$$

Here, $F_{1,2,L}(x,Q^2)$ denote the nucleon structure functions for photon exchange, and $q(x,Q^2)$ and $\overline{q}(x,Q^2)$ are the quark– and antiquark distribution functions. The sub–system variables obey the following rescaling relations for initial– and final–state radiation :

$$\begin{aligned}\textsf{ISR}\ :\quad & \widehat{y} = \frac{y_h}{z}, \quad \widehat{Q}^2 = zQ_l^2 = Q_h^2, \quad \widehat{S} = zS, \quad \widehat{x} = zx_m = x_h, \\ & J^I(z) = 1, \qquad z_0^I = \min\left\{y_h, \frac{Q_0^2}{Q_l^2}\right\}\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\textsf{FSR}\ :\quad & \widehat{y} = y_h, \quad \widehat{Q}^2 = \frac{Q_l^2}{z} = Q_h^2, \quad \widehat{S} = S, \quad \widehat{x} = \frac{x_m}{z} = x_h, \\ & J^F(z) = \frac{1}{z}, \qquad z_0^I = x_m\ .\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Here, $J^{I,F}(z)$ are the initial– and final–state Jacobians $d^2(\widehat{y},\widehat{Q}^2)/d^2(y_h,Q_l^2)$, and z_0 marks the lower bound of the sub–system rescaling variable $z\ \epsilon\ [z_0,1]$. The rescaling in Eqs. (4,5) was chosen such that both the initial– and final–state operator matrix elements can be expressed by a variable $z\ \epsilon\ [0,1]$. Q_0^2 is introduced as a scale to cut away contributions of the Compton peak. Although these terms do formally belong to the QED radiative corrections, they stem from a kinematic domain of low virtualities and are therefore not being associated to deep inelastic scattering. The scale $Q_0^2 \simeq 1$ GeV^2 or larger can be chosen by experiment accepting only those events in the sample to be analyzed for which the *hadronic* Q^2 is larger than Q_0^2. By this measure the Compton peak is cut away widely and the QED–correction factor is dominated by a deep–inelastic sub–process by far. Finally we note that in the case of mixed variables the leptonic QED radiative corrections can be easily grouped into those for the initial and final state. The separation scale between the two kinematic regions is Q_l^2, i.e. we speak of initial state radiation for $Q_h^2 < Q_l^2$ and of final state radiation for $Q_h^2 > Q_l^2$.

[3] See e.g. Refs. [8,2,5] for a comparison of a wide range of different choices of measurement.

[4] As we discuss radiative corrections we will speak about an $O(\alpha^k)$ contribution for a cross section being proportional to α^{2+k}.

3 NLO corrections

In this paper we limit the consideration to the calculation of the NLO corrections to leptonic variables for one–photon exchange in electron–nucleon scattering. This approach is widely model independent and allows to refer to general non–perturbative parameterizations of the structure functions which describe the hadronic tensor. In this way a direct unfolding of the experimentally measured structure functions is possible down to the range in Q^2 and x in which partonic approaches fail to provide a description of structure functions.[5] The radiative corrections are thus valid as well for inclusive *diffractive ep*–scattering, see e.g. [22]. The radiative corrections to be calculated concern a neutral–current process in which the lepton stays the same : both an incoming electron (positron) results into an outgoing electron (positron). As was already pointed out in Ref. [8] changes of the fermion species are possible starting with 2–loop order. To keep the QED K–factor close to the basic process we limit the consideration of the present paper to those contributions in which the electron–type is preserved. The scattering cross section to $O(\alpha^2)$ reads :

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d^2\sigma}{dy_h dQ_l^2} &= C^{(0,0)}(y_h,Q_l^2) + \frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\left\{\ln\left(\frac{Q_l^2}{m_e^2}\right)C^{(1,0)}(y_h,Q_l^2) + C^{(1,1)}(y_h,Q_l^2)\right\} \\ &+ \left(\frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\right)^2\left\{\ln^2\left(\frac{Q_l^2}{m_e^2}\right)C^{(2,0)}(y_h,Q_l^2) + \ln\left(\frac{Q_l^2}{m_e^2}\right)C^{(2,1)}(y_h,Q_l^2) + C^{(2,2)}(y_h,Q_l^2)\right\}\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

with $C^{(0,0)}(y_h,Q_l^2) = d^2\sigma^0/dy_h dQ_l^2$ and $\alpha = e^2/(4\pi)$. The $O\left[(\alpha L)\right]$ and $O\left[(\alpha L)^2\right]$ corrections were calculated in Ref. [12]. The term $C^{(1,1)}(y_h,Q_l^2)$ was derived in Ref. [5] completing the $O(\alpha)$ corrections. We re-calculated these corrections and agree with the previous results.

The NLO–correction $C^{(2,1)}(y_h,Q_l^2)$ can be obtained representing the scattering cross section using mass–factorization, see [17][6]. Although the differential scattering cross section does not contain any mass singularity, one may decompose it in terms of Wilson coefficients and operator-matrix elements being convoluted with the Born cross section. In this decomposition both the operator matrix elements and the Wilson coefficients depend on the factorization scale μ^2. One writes the scattering cross section as

$$\frac{d^2\sigma}{dy_h dQ_l^2} = \frac{d^2\sigma^0}{dy_h dQ_l^2} \otimes \left\{\Gamma_{ee}^I \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{ee} \otimes \Gamma_{ee}^F + \Gamma_{\gamma e}^I \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{e\gamma} \otimes \Gamma_{ee}^F + \Gamma_{ee}^I \otimes \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma e} \otimes \Gamma_{e\gamma}^F\right\}, \tag{7}$$

with $\Gamma_{ij}^{I,F}(z,\mu^2/m_e^2)$ the initial and final state operator matrix elements and $\hat{\sigma}_{kl}(z,Q^2/\mu^2)$ the respective Wilson coefficients. $\otimes$ denotes a convolution, which depends on specific rescalings of the chosen kinematic variables for the differential cross sections and is specified below. Both the operator matrix elements and the Wilson coefficients obey the representations

$$\Gamma_{ij}^{I,F}\left(z,\frac{\mu^2}{m_e^2}\right) = \delta(1-z) + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\right)^m \sum_{n=0}^{m}\Gamma_{ij}^{I,F(m,n)}(z)\ln^{m-n}\left(\frac{\mu^2}{m_e^2}\right), \tag{8}$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_{kl}\left(z,\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}\right) = \delta(1-z) + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\right)^m \sum_{n=0}^{m}\hat{\sigma}_{kl}^{(m,n)}(z)\ln^{m-n}\left(\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}\right). \tag{9}$$

[5] Quarkonic and lepton-hadron interference contributions are not included in this approach. They are of smaller size in general [20, 8, 21].

[6] Very recently also the electron energy spectrum in muon decay has been calculated using this method [23].

The sequences $\{ij\}$ and $\{kl\}$ in the above do always denote $j(l)$ for the incoming and $i(k)$ the outgoing particle. As the differential cross section is μ–independent, the cross section is expressed by convolutions of the functions $\Gamma_{ij}^{I,F(m,n)}(z)$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{kl}^{(m,n)}(z)$ such that the μ^2–dependence cancels and a structure like Eq. (6) is obtained. The treatment in the OMS scheme assumes that the light fermion mass, m_e, is kept everywhere it is giving a finite contribution to the scattering cross section if compared to the large scale Q^2, i.e. the only terms being neglected are power corrections which are of $O\left[(m_e^2/Q^2)^k\right]$, $k \geq 1$ and therefore small. The last step is necessary to maintain the anticipated convolution structure which, in parts, is of the Mellin–type, as also in a massless approach.

In the subsequent relations we make frequent use of the rescaling (4,5). For this purpose we introduce the following short–hand notation for the rescaling of a function $F(y, Q^2)$

$$\widetilde{F}_{I,F}(y, Q^2) = F\left(y = \widehat{y}_{I,F}, Q^2 = \widehat{Q}^2_{I,F}\right) \ , \tag{10}$$

where I, F label the respective type of rescaling. The NLO–corrections may be grouped into the following contributions :

- i LO initial and final state radiation off $C_{ee}^{(1,1)}(y, Q^2)$
- ii coupling constant renormalization of $C_{ee}^{(1,1)}(y, Q^2)$
- iii LO initial state splitting of $P_{\gamma e}$ at $C_{e\gamma}^{(1,1)}(y, Q^2)$
- iv LO final state splitting of $P_{e\gamma}$ at $C_{\gamma e}^{(1,1)}(y, Q^2)$
- v NLO initial and final state radiation off $C_{ee}^{(0,0)}(y, Q^2)$

The function $C^{(2,1)}(y, Q^2)$ then is given by

$$C^{(2,1)}(y, Q^2) = \sum_{i=\mathsf{i}}^{\mathsf{v}} C_i^{(2,1)}(y, Q^2), \tag{11}$$

where $y = y_h$, $Q^2 = Q_l^2$. The function $C_{\mathsf{i}}^{(2,1)}(y, Q^2)$ is obtained by

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\mathsf{i}}^{(2,1)}(y, Q^2) &= \int_0^1 dz P_{ee}^0(z) \left[\theta\left(z - z_0^I\right) J^I(z) \widetilde{C}_I^{(1,1)}(y, Q^2) - C^{(1,1)}(y, Q^2)\right] \\ &+ \int_0^1 dz P_{ee}^0(z) \left[\theta\left(z - z_0^F\right) J^F(z) \widetilde{C}_F^{(1,1)}(y, Q^2) - C^{(1,1)}(y, Q^2)\right], \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $C^{(1,1)}(y, Q^2)$ denotes the non–logarithmic part of the $O(\alpha)$ correction [5, 18] and $P_{ee}^0(z)$ is the LO fermion–fermion splitting function

$$P_{ee}^0(z) = \frac{1 + z^2}{1 - z} \ . \tag{13}$$

To illustrate the convolution structure in (7) we note that

$$C^{(1,1)}(y, Q^2) = \left[\widehat{\sigma}_{ee}^{(1,1)} + \Gamma_{ee}^{I,(1,1)} + \Gamma_{ee}^{F,(1,1)}\right] \otimes C^{(0,0)}(y, Q^2) \ . \tag{14}$$

Also the LO off-diagonal splitting functions

$$P^0_{e\gamma}(z) = z^2 + (1-z)^2 \tag{15}$$

$$P^0_{\gamma e}(z) = \frac{1+(1-z)^2}{z} \tag{16}$$

occur in other contributions to $C^{(2,1)}$. Here both for LO and NLO splitting functions for equal particle transitions we write the contributions for $z < 1$ and account for the +-functions in explicit form below.

We express the final result for $C^{(2,1)}(y,Q^2)$ in terms of the QED coupling constant $a(m_e^2)$. Therefore we have to expand all contributions using

$$\alpha(\mu^2) = \alpha(m_e^2)\left[1 - \frac{\alpha}{4\pi}\beta_0 \ln\left(\frac{\mu^2}{m_e^2}\right)\right] , \tag{17}$$

with $\beta_0 = -4/3$. In the present paper we only consider photonic corrections and those due to a single light fermion. The generalization to various fermions and non–perturbative contributions due to light quarks is, however, straightforward. The running–coupling contribution to $C^{(2,1)}(y,Q^2)$ resulting from $C^{(1,1)}(y,Q^2)$ is thus given by

$$C^{(2,1)}_{\mathsf{ii}}(y,Q^2) = -\frac{\beta_0}{2} C^{(1,1)}(y,Q^2) . \tag{18}$$

The contributions $C^{(2,1)}_{\mathsf{iii,iv}}(y,Q^2)$ refer to two new $O(\alpha)$ cross sections : $d^2\sigma^{\gamma e,(1)}/dydQ^2$ and $d^2\sigma^{e\gamma,(1)}/dydQ^2$. The corrections are

$$C^{(2,1)}_{\mathsf{iii}}(y,Q^2) = \int_{z_0^I}^1 dz P^0_{\gamma e}(z) J^I(z) \widetilde{C}^{(1,1)}_{e\gamma,I}(y,Q^2) , \tag{19}$$

$$C^{(2,1)}_{\mathsf{iv}}(y,Q^2) = \int_{z_0^F}^1 dz P^0_{e\gamma}(z) J^F(z) \widetilde{C}^{(1,1)}_{\gamma e,F}(y,Q^2) . \tag{20}$$

In these processes electrons and positrons are pair produced in the final state. The $O(\alpha)$ sub–system cross sections read :

$$\frac{d^2\sigma^{\gamma e,(1)}}{dydQ^2} = \frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\left[\ln\left(\frac{Q^2}{m_e^2}\right) C^{(1,0)}_{\gamma e}(y,Q^2) + C^{(1,1)}_{\gamma e}(y,Q^2)\right] , \tag{21}$$

$$\frac{d^2\sigma^{e\gamma,(1)}}{dydQ^2} = \frac{\alpha}{2\pi}\left[\ln\left(\frac{Q^2}{m_e^2}\right) C^{(1,0)}_{e\gamma}(y,Q^2) + C^{(1,1)}_{e\gamma}(y,Q^2)\right] . \tag{22}$$

Here, the functions $C^{(1,0)}_{ij}(y,Q^2)$ are given by

$$C^{(1,0)}_{e\gamma}(y,Q^2) = \int_{z_0^I}^1 dz P^0_{e\gamma}(z) J_I(z) \widetilde{C}^{(0,0)}_I(y,Q^2) , \tag{23}$$

$$C^{(1,0)}_{\gamma e}(y,Q^2) = \int_{z_0^F}^1 dz P^0_{\gamma e}(z) J_F(z) \widetilde{C}^{(0,0)}_F(y,Q^2) , \tag{24}$$

and the functions $C_{e\gamma}^{(1,1)}(y,Q^2)$ and $C_{\gamma e}^{(1,1)}(y,Q^2)$ are :

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_{e\gamma}^{(1,1)}(y,Q^2) &= \frac{2\pi\alpha^2}{y_h Q_l^4}\int_{z_0^I}^1 \frac{dz}{z^2}\Bigg\{\Bigg[P_{e\gamma}^0(z)\ln\left[\frac{(1-z)(z-y_h)}{z}\right]-(1+2z)\ln\left(\frac{z}{y_h}\right)\\
&\qquad -1+\frac{z}{y_h}+2z(1-z)\Bigg]\, y_h^2\; 2x_m F_1(x_h,Q_h^2)\\
&\qquad +2\Bigg[(z-y_h)P_{e\gamma}^0(z)\ln\left[\frac{(1-z)(z-y_h)}{z}\right]-y_h\ln\left(\frac{z}{y_h}\right)\\
&\qquad +(z-y_h)\left[\frac{y_h}{z}-1-2y_h+8z+2y_h z-8z^2\right]\Bigg]F_2(x_h,Q_h^2)\Bigg\}\\
&+\frac{2\pi\alpha^2}{y_h Q_l^4}\int_{z_0^F}^1 dz\Bigg\{\left[\frac{1}{z}P_{\gamma e}^0(z)\ln\left(\frac{1-y_h z}{1-z}\right)+\left(1+\frac{2}{z}\right)\ln(y_h)-\frac{1}{z}+\frac{1}{z y_h}\right]\\
&\qquad \times y_h^2\; 2x_m F_1(x_h,Q_h^2)\\
&+2\Bigg[\frac{1}{z}P_{\gamma e}^0(z)\left(\frac{1}{z}-y_h\right)\ln\left(\frac{1-y_h z}{1-z}\right)+y_h\ln(y_h)+\frac{1-y_h^2}{z}-2\frac{1-y_h}{z^2}\Bigg]\\
&\qquad \times F_2(x_h,Q_h^2)\Bigg\},
\end{aligned}
\tag{25}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_{\gamma e}^{(1,1)}(y,Q^2) &= \frac{2\pi\alpha^2}{y_h Q_l^4}\int_{z_0^I}^1 \frac{dz}{z^2}\Bigg\{\left[\frac{1}{z}P_{e\gamma}^0(z)\ln\left(\frac{1-y_h}{1-z}\right)+z\ln\left(\frac{z}{y_h}\right)-1+\frac{z}{y_h}\right]\, y_h^2\; 2x_m F_1(x_h,Q_h^2)\\
&\qquad +2\Bigg[\frac{1}{z^2}P_{e\gamma}^0(z)(1-y_h)\ln\left(\frac{1-y_h}{1-z}\right)-y_h\ln\left(\frac{z}{y_h}\right)\\
&\qquad -\frac{z-y_h}{2z^2}\left(2-y_h-3z+2y_h z\right)\Bigg]F_2(x_h,Q_h^2)\Bigg\}\\
&+\frac{2\pi\alpha^2}{y_h Q_l^4}\int_{z_0^F}^1 dz\Bigg\{\left[P_{\gamma e}^0(z)\ln\left(\frac{(1-y_h)(1-z)}{z^2}\right)-\frac{1}{z}\ln(y_h)+2-\frac{3}{z}+\frac{1}{y_h z}\right]\\
&\qquad \times y_h^2\; 2x_m F_1(x_h,Q_h^2)\\
&\qquad +2\Bigg[zP_{\gamma e}^0(z)(1-y_h)\ln\left(\frac{(1-y_h)(1-z)}{z^2}\right)+y_h\ln(y_h)\\
&\qquad -\frac{1}{2}(1-y_h)(7-y_h-14z+4y_h z+6z^2-2y_h z^2)\Bigg]\; F_2(x_h,Q_h^2)\Bigg\}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{26}
$$

Finally, the term $C_{\mathsf{v}}^{(2,1)}(y,Q^2)$ is given by :

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_{\mathsf{v}}^{(2,1)}(y,Q^2) &= \int_0^1 P_{ee,S}^{1,NS,\mathrm{OM}}(z)\left[\theta\left(z-z_0^I\right)J^I(z)\widetilde{C}_I^{(0,0)}(y,Q^2)-C^{(0,0)}(y,Q^2)\right]\\
&+ \int_{z_0^I}^1 P_{ee,S}^{1,PS,\mathrm{OM}}(z)J^I(z)\widetilde{C}_I^{(0,0)}(y,Q^2)\\
&+ \int_0^1 P_{ee,T}^{1,NS,\mathrm{OM}}(z)\left[\theta\left(z-z_0^F\right)J^F(z)\widetilde{C}_F^{(0,0)}(y,Q^2)-C^{(0,0)}(y,Q^2)\right]\\
&+ \int_{z_0^F}^1 P_{ee,T}^{1,PS,\mathrm{OM}}(z)J^F(z)\widetilde{C}_F^{(0,0)}(y,Q^2).
\end{aligned}
\tag{27}
$$

Here $P^1_{ee,S,T}(z)$ denote the space– and time–like NLO QED splitting functions of the non–singlet (NS) and pure–singlet (PS) channels. The label OM refers to the OMS scheme. We express these splitting functions referring to the splitting functions in the $\overline{\rm MS}$–scheme [24] :

$$\begin{aligned}
P^{1,NS,\overline{\rm MS}}_{ee,S}(z) &= -2P^0_{ee}(z)\ln(z)\left[\ln(1-z)+\frac{3}{4}\right] - \frac{1}{2}(1+z)\ln^2(z) - \frac{1}{2}(3+7z)\ln(z) \\
&\quad -5(1-z) - \frac{2}{3}\left\{P^0_{ee}(z)\left[\ln(z)+\frac{5}{3}\right] + 2(1-z)\right\}, \qquad (28)\\
P^{1,PS,\overline{\rm MS}}_{ee,S}(z) &= -(1+z)\ln^2(z) + \left[1+5z+\frac{8}{3}z^2\right]\ln(z) + \frac{2}{9}\left(\frac{1-z}{z}\right)\left(10+z+28z^2\right), \qquad (29)\\
P^{1,NS,\overline{\rm MS}}_{ee,T}(z) &= 2P^0_{ee}(z)\ln(z)\left[\ln(1-z)-\ln(z)+\frac{3}{4}\right] + \frac{1}{2}(1+z)\ln^2(z) - \frac{1}{2}(7+3z)\ln(z) \\
&\quad -5(1-z) - \frac{2}{3}\left\{P^0_{ee}(z)\left[\ln(z)+\frac{5}{3}\right] + 2(1-z)\right\}, \qquad (30)\\
P^{1,PS,\overline{\rm MS}}_{ee,T}(z) &= (1+z)\ln^2(z) - \left[5+9z+\frac{8}{3}z^2\right]\ln(z) - \frac{4}{9}\left(\frac{1-z}{z}\right)\left(5+23z+14z^2\right). \qquad (31)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the splitting functions $P^{1,PS,\overline{\rm MS}}_{ee,S,T}(z)$ refer to *one* light fermion *or one* light anti–fermion, contrary to the QCD singlet case, where always the sum of a light quark and an antiquark is considered. The splitting functions in the OMS are obtained by

$$\begin{aligned}
P^{1,NS,\rm OM}_{ee,S,T}(z) &= P^{1,NS,\overline{\rm MS}}_{ee,S,T}(z) + \frac{\beta_0}{2}\Gamma^{S,T,(1,1)}_{ee}(z)\ , \qquad (32)\\
\Gamma^{S,T,(1,1)}_{ee}(z) &= -2\left[\frac{1+z^2}{1-z}\left(\ln(1-z)+\frac{1}{2}\right)\right]\ , \qquad (33)
\end{aligned}$$

with $I = S, F = T$, and $P^{1,PS,\rm OM}_{ee,S,T}(z) = P^{1,PS,\overline{\rm MS}}_{ee,S,T}(z)$.

4 Conclusions

We calculated the $O(\alpha^2 L)$ leptonic QED corrections to deep inelastic ep scattering for the case of mixed variables. The corrections are given in terms of double–differential distributions to be compared to the double differential Born cross section. The calculation was performed using the renormalization–group decomposition of the 2–loop corrections to the differential cross section w.r.t. mass factorization in the OMS scheme for the light fermion mass. Mass factorization introduces an artificial factorization scale μ^2 on which the physical cross section does not depend. By the elimination of this scale the structure of the differential cross section is re–organized in terms of pieces which can be calculated first individually and which are then composed to the desired correction term to be obtained. The NLO correction consists out of five terms, the LO ISR and FSR radiation correction of the non–logarithmic $O(\alpha)$ contribution, a respective term due to charge renormalization, two new terms containing $e-\gamma-e$ initial and final state transitions, and the ISR and FSR OMS–NLO radiation correction to the Born term.

Acknowledgement.
We would like to thank W.L. van Neerven and V. Ravindran for discussions. The work was supported in part by EU–TMR Network HPRN-CT-2000-00149.

References

[1] L.W. Mo and Yung-Su Tsai, Rev. Mod. Phys. **41** (1969) 205;
D. Bardin, O.Fedorenko, and N. Shumeiko, J. Phys. **G** (1981) 1331;
M. Böhm and H. Spiesberger, Nucl. Phys. **B294** (1987) 1091; **B304** (1988) 749;
D. Bardin, C. Burdik, P. Christova, and T. Riemann, Dubna preprint E2–87–595; Z. Phys. **C42** (1989) 679; **C44** (1989) 149;
A. Kwiatkowski, H. Spiesberger and H.J. Möhring, Comput. Phys. Commun. **69** (1992) 155;
A. Akhundov, D. Bardin, L. Kalinovskaya, and T. Riemann, Phys. Lett. **B301** (1993) 447; revised in: `hep-ph/9507278`.

[2] A. Arbuzov, D. Bardin, J. Blümlein, L. Kalinovskaya, and T. Riemann, Comp. Phys. Commun. **94** (1996) 128.

[3] H. Spiesberger, et al., Radiative Corrections at HERA, in: Proc. of the 1991 HERA Physics Workshop, p. 798, eds. W. Buchmüller and G. Ingelman, CERN-TH-6447-92, and references therein.

[4] D. Bardin, P. Christova, L. Kalinovskaya, and T. Riemann, Phys. Lett. **B357** (1995) 456.

[5] A. Akhundov, D. Bardin, L. Kalinovskaya, and T. Riemann, Fortsch. Phys. **44** (1996) 373.

[6] D. Bardin, J. Blümlein, P. Christova, and L. Kalinovskaya, Nucl. Phys. **B506** (1997) 295;
I. Akusevich, A. Ilichev, and N. Shumeiko, Phys. Atom. Nucl. **61** (1998) 2154 [Yad. Fiz. **61** (1998) 2268]; `hep-ph/0106180`.

[7] M. Consoli and M. Greco, Nucl. Phys. **B186** (1981) 519;
E.A. Kuraev, N.P. Merenkov, and V.S. Fadin, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **47** (1988) 1009;
W. Beenakker, F. Berends, and W. van Neerven, Proceedings of the Ringberg Workshop 1989, ed. J.H. Kühn, (Springer, Berlin, 1989), p. 3.

[8] J. Blümlein, Z. Phys. **C47** (1990) 89.

[9] J. Blümlein, Phys. Lett. **B271** (1991) 267; PHE-91-016, HELIOS 1.00: a program to calculate leading log QED corrections to *ep* scattering, DESY HERA Workshop (1991), 1270–1284, eds. W. Buchmüller and G. Ingelman;
G. Montagna, O. Nicrosini, and L. Trentadue, Nucl. Phys. **B357** (1991) 390;
J. Blümlein, G.J. van Oldenborgh, and R. Rückl, Nucl. Phys. **B395** (1993) 35.

[10] J. Kripfganz, H.J. Möhring, and H. Spiesberger, Z. Phys. **C49** (1991) 501.

[11] J. Blümlein and H. Kawamura, Acta Phys. Pol. **B33** (2002) 3719; DESY 02-016.

[12] J. Blümlein, Z. Phys. **C65** (1995) 293.

[13] J. Blümlein, S. Riemersma, and A. Vogt, Acta Phys. Pol. **B27** (1996) 1309; Eur. Phys. J. **C1** (1998) 255; Nucl. Phys. **B** Proc. Suppl. **51C** (1996) 30;
J. Blümlein and A. Vogt, Acta Phys. Pol. **B27** (1996) 1309; Phys. Lett. **B370** (1996) 149;

B386 (1996) 350;
R. Kirschner and L. Lipatov, Nucl. Phys. **B213** (1983) 122;
J. Bartels, B. Ermolaev, and M. Ryskin, Z. Phys. **C72** (1996) 627.

[14] J.Blümlein and A. Vogt, Phys. Rev. **D57** (1998) 1; **D58** (1998) 014020;
R.D. Ball and S. Forte, `hep-ph/9805315`;
J. Blümlein, V. Ravindran, W.L. van Neerven, and A. Vogt, `hep-ph/9806368`.

[15] J. Blümlein, G. Levman, and H. Spiesberger, in : Proceedings of the Workshop Research Directions of the Decade, Snowmass, CO, June 25–July 14, 1990, ed. E.L. Berger, World Scientific, Singapore, 1992, p. 549;
A. Courau and P. Kessler, Phys. Rev. **D46** (1992) 117;
J. Blümlein, G. Levman, and H. Spiesberger, J. Phys. **G19** (1993) 1695.

[16] K. Symanzik, Commun. Math. Phys. **18** (1970) 227; **34** (1973) 7;
C.G. Callan, Jr., Phys. Rev. **D2** (1970) 1541.

[17] F. Berends, W. van Neerven, and G. Burgers, Nucl. Phys. **B297** (1988) 429; E: **B304** (1988) 921.

[18] J. Blümlein and H. Kawamura, to apprear.

[19] J. Blümlein and M. Klein, Nucl. Instr. Meth. **A329** (1993) 112.

[20] J. Kripfganz and H. Perlt, Z. Phys. **C41** (1988) 319.

[21] H. Spiesberger, Phys. Rev. **D52** (1995) 4936.

[22] J. Blümlein and D. Robaschik, Phys. Lett. **B517** (2001) 222; Phys. Rev. **D65** (2002) 096002.

[23] A. Arbuzov and K. Melnikov, Phys. Rev. **D66** (2002) 093003.

[24] G. Curci, W. Furmanski, and R. Petronzio, Nucl. Phys. **B175** (1980) 27;
W. Furmanski and R. Petronzio, Phys. Lett. **B97** (1980) 437;
E.G. Floratos, C. Kounnas, and R. Lacaze, Nucl. Phys. **B192** (1981) 417.